



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Into the details of the two final chapters of Mr. Walker's book, on the Credibility of the Narrative, lack of space forbids me to enter. His place is in general with Eduard Meyer, for he is convinced that Ephorus, if we may now give the author of the papyrus his name, has to be seriously reckoned with even when he comes into conflict with Xenophon. He says rather pessimistically:

It is not the least important result of the literary finds of the last quarter of a century that we are beginning to realize that our certitude in regard to the details of Ancient History is largely an illusion. The great historians have gone uncontradicted, because there was commonly no other authority, of at all the same rank, with which to confront them. But where comparison was possible divergencies and contradictions were at once apparent.

Thucydides contradicts Herodotus; Aristotle contradicts both of them and Xenophon as well; now Ephorus contradicts, and contradicts very flatly, Xenophon. What are we to do about it? This question historians of Greece may answer differently: they cannot afford to shirk it.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Ancient Eugenics (the Arnold Prize Essay for 1913).

By A. G. Roper. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell (1913). 76 pp.

In one form or another, eugenics is perhaps as old as babies, but as a science it can hardly be traced back of Sir Francis Galton, who laid the foundations a half century ago and first applied the term in 1884. The researches of a eugenist among our classical authors might, therefore, be expected to result in some novel finds and in an especially illuminating treatment of the material. Unfortunately this book is by no means exhaustive, nor even sufficient to satisfy the ordinary investigator into the life of the ancients. Reference to such accessible works as Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, I, 3, 82-83, and Daremberg et Saglio, s. v. *expositio*, not to speak of others, would have acquainted its author with passages too important to overlook. On the other hand, the writer's point of view is responsible for an interesting and suggestive book.

Following an excellent Introduction, in which he theorizes about the usages among prehistoric savages and traces the general development of eugenic ideas, Mr. Roper conducts the reader to his selection of Latin passages. These concern almost exclusively times long after Aristotle, with whom he is later to bring his account of Greek eugenics practically to completion. Christianity's abolition of infanticide is the chief differential factor between the old eugenics and the new. While the pagan would unhesitatingly end the existence of the child he deemed unfit to live, we prolong the life of even the obviously useless. Infanticide, indeed, spared the Greeks many of the problems of heredity with which we are wrestling as yet almost hopelessly, because, as the essayist frankly states, our actual knowledge is for practical, constructive purposes hardly

greater than that of Plato. The crucial trouble, the fact that the possession of a *corpus sanum*, the ultimate aim of the eugenist, does not insure the possession of a *mens sana* is still to be faced and will perhaps exist forever. Productivity and mental and moral superiority are scarcely commensurate.

While the reviewer approached his task with a strong desire to pass a favorable judgment, he has been shocked to find among the rather limited references that the author gives such a formidable number of errors as to suggest inevitably not only carelessness but also a dependence upon secondary sources for the material used. Thus, we should read on page 12, note 4, ii. 15, and, in note 5, i. 15.2; on p. 13, note 3, x. 33; on p. 17, note 2, 555 c; on p. 21, note 1, 276 d. On p. 19 in note 1 the 37 might be omitted. The 553 c is incorrect on p. 22, note 3. On p. 30 in note 1 the 20 should be replaced by vii. 2. 3. Note 9 of p. 33 also has a wrong reference and there are others.

It is not safe to say (p. 13) that "Quintilian declared that the exposed rarely survived" on the strength of "Dec." cccvi. 6, since this Declamatio may never have even met his eye. Even if one could accept the conclusions drawn from Pliny's boast (p. 14: "for 600 years Rome had known no doctors"), the figures given need rectification in the light of what he really says in his H. N. 29. (6) 12, and chronology forbids us to believe that "Aratus voices again the lament of Horace" (15). Xenophon does not speak of Sparta as having the smallest population in Greece (23). It was Epigenes and not Epigones (39) that vexed Socrates. Kratesickleia (19) might sick-en both those who represent kappa by a *k* and those who prefer the *c*, but in this matter the book is repeatedly at fault. Greek words, too, are spelled or accented wrongly. The reviewer would like a reference for the statements that "the Indians . . . offer up children to Moloch (the Semitic God!) . . . the Carthaginians sacrifice them to Kronos", on page 8 (Diodorus Siculus 20. 14. 6 states that the Carthaginians sacrificed children to Kronos; but his identification of Moloch with Kronos is absurd). The allegation (9) that "among the Prussians the aged and infirm, the sick and deformed, were unhesitatingly put to death", was important enough even before the war to deserve a reference to the evidence, but this is only one of a number of statements for which the source is not given. The last sentences on page 25 represent a conflatus of Xenophon *De Rep. Lac.* 1.10 and 5.9, but Mr. Roper has not rendered the former passage correctly. The first note on page 55 is not an adequate reference to a work that is divided into three books.

If some of these errors might lead one to suppose that the graduate of Oxford who received at the hands of the Regius Professor of Modern History, the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and the Camden Professor of Ancient History the high honor and financial reward of the Arnold Prize was somewhat deficient in Greek and Latin, he needs to read but a few pages to dispel his doubts. Only a classicist could use so

familiarly such words as non-viable, dichotomize, deliquescent, stiripiculture, biometry, aggeneration, unigeniture, dysgenic and entelechy, but I humbly submit that one sentence on page 53, "From the fantastic laconism of the Republic and the visionary parenthesis of the Politicus we pass to the palinode of disillusioned senility, the Laws", is a *monstrum* which according to the practice mentioned by Seneca, *De Ira* i. 15.2, should be 'merged'.

The only other passage that makes an equally unfortunate impression is on page 21, where I am sure that even a pretty good Hellenist would need the help of several references not given, and would recognize "bouagor" better than 'buagor'. Moreover, while this personage and the ilarch might possibly be spoken of as having bureaucratic control, why should the melliran be linked with them? Merely because of age (Krause, *Die Gymnastik und Agonistik der Hellenen* i. 278)? But Grasberger, *Erziehung und Unterricht*, 3. 58-59, is correct on this.

Mr. Roper's treatment of eugenics among the Greeks is naturally more detailed, and we find valuable interpretations and reflections as well as useful references to the more recent literature, the papers delivered at the Eugenics Congress and other publications that are available in our larger libraries. After discussing the ideas and practices of the Spartans, Cretans, Carthaginians and Germans, he takes up the sporadic passages in the early Greek poets that concern his subject, and then, at some length, Euripides. From Xenophon's *Memorabilia* he extracts the oral teachings of Socrates as a preliminary to his study of the opinions of his pupils Critias and Plato. The latter's indebtedness to the Spartan system is duly emphasized. Lastly comes Aristotle, and in him we find no merely academic discussion of the problems of birth, marriage, etc., as they affect an ideal state, but an effort to propose a plan of social reform that would really 'work' at Athens. Since Mr. Roper holds that in him culminates the history of ancient eugenics, he refers only briefly to later philosophers, and after alluding to the modern vagaries of More's *Utopia*, Campanella's *City of the Sun*, etc., he closes with this admirable summary: So Eugenics, ruthlessly practised in those distant ages, "when wild in wood the noble savage ran", rudely systematized, passed into the constitution of Sparta. The selfish creed of a warrior caste, even in the hands of Plato and Aristotle it never lost its parochialism, and when this narrow spirit gave way before the cosmopolitanism of subsequent philosophy, individualism, isolating human effort from a world rational only to the evolutionist, effectually checked the growth of the Eugenic ideal for centuries.

UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA.

WALTON BROOKS MCDANIEL.

The Kings of Lydia, and a Rearrangement of Some Fragments from Nicolaus of Damascus. Princeton Doctoral Dissertation, accepted June, 1911. By Leigh Alexander (1913). Pp. 61.

This treatise is a product of the interest in the country of Lydia inspired at Princeton University by the excavations at Sardis, and seeks to systematize our knowledge of the kings of that land. The sources are mainly the first book of Herodotus, the fragments of Xanthus's *Lydiaca*, and some fragments of the *Universal History* of Nicolaus of Damascus, with certain lists of the kings in the Christian chronographers.

In the first chapter, Dr. Alexander examines the order and assignment to books of the fragments of Nicolaus, Books 1-8, so far as they come to us in the *Excerpta de Virtutibus et Vitiis*, and in the *Excerpta de Insidiis*, prepared for the Emperor Constantinus Porphyrogenitus. He accepts Müller's arrangement for the former, as given in the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* 3. 345 ff., 356 ff., but for the fragments coming from the *De Insidiis* he proposes a slightly different order and assignment, which enables us to adopt the view that the excerpts for both collections were made in the same manner—an eminently reasonable supposition. The importance of this rearrangement for Dr. Alexander is that all the passages bearing on Lydia are seen now to come from two sections of Nicolaus, the first part of the fourth book and the middle of the seventh book, instead of from three separate books. Manifestly, this is important for the relative chronology of the kings mentioned in the passages.

In the second chapter there is a discussion of the three persons named Meles, one mentioned in Herodotus, the other two in Nicolaus's fragments. The conclusion reached is that the three are really identical, and that this Meles was a usurper, probably toward the end of the reign of the first Ardys, and that he was driven out by Moxos (a general, not a king), supposedly to Babylon. Seemingly he got back again into power, only to be expelled permanently; and a report was circulated that he was responsible for the assassination of the first Daskylos.

In the third chapter Dr. Alexander examines the various lists of kings and draws up a new stemma. The names Sadyattes, Adyattes, and Alyattes appear used of the same persons, and are evidently merely different forms of the same word; and, as this appellation is given not only to most of the kings, but even to kings for whom another name is presented, it is likely that this was either a name common in the royal family, borne frequently in addition to another name, or was a title belonging equally to all the Lydian kings, as indeed was suggested by Radet, *La Lydie et le monde grec au temps des Mermnades*, 77-78. Then, by a series of careful identifications of names differing not too greatly, Dr. Alexander constructs his new stemma, with nine kings. First, in the line of the Tylonii or Heracleidae, we have an Adyattes whose special name is not recorded, Akiamos or Ardys, Myrsos, and Kandaules. Kandaules was murdered and was succeeded by Gyges, son of Daskylos, as is related by Herodotus. The remaining kings belong to the line of the Mermnadae or Dascylii: Gyges, already mentioned; the second Ardys; Kam-